

NO

DOMINION ELECTION.

CAMPAIGN OF 1886.

Hon. Edward Blake's Speeches.

No. 3 (First Series).

The Public Finances. Broken Promises.

Enormous Taxation. Huge Deficits.

What can be done for Farmers.

SPEECH AT CHESLEY.

NOTE.—See Inside Cover for List of Mr. Blake's Speeches in first Series. Apply to W. T. R. Preston, Reform Club, Toronto, for Copies of these Speeches.

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PRINTERS.

1886.

LIST OF SPEECHES IN THIS SERIES.

- No. 1.—(LONDON): General Review of Situation. Riel Question.
(OWEN SOUND): North-West Maladministration. Riel.
- No. 2.—(BEAVERTON): Independence of Parliament. The Boodle Brigade.
- No. 3.—(CHESLEY): Public Finances—Taxation and Deficits—Farmers.
- No. 4.—(SIMCOE): Federal and Provincial Rights—Ontario—Nova Scotia.
(GUELPH): Elections near.—Tory Dodges—Nova Scotia.
- No. 5.—(OWEN SOUND): Principles of Liberalism—Duty of the Leader.
(WELLAND): Policy of the Party—Functions of an Opposition.
(OAKWOOD): Sir J. Macdonald on Functions of an Opposition.
- No. 6.—*Extracts*—(GUELPH): Home Rule for Ireland.
(BERLIN): Firebrand Tory attempts to excite Germans.
(GALT & ORANGEVILLE): Indian Starvation Policy.
(PEMBROKE): Maladministration felt at Cut Knife Hill.
- No. 7.—*Extracts*—(KENDALL): Business Methods required in Public Affairs
—Degradation of Parliament—A few Boodlers.
(HAMPTON): Civil Service Reform.
(GALT): Burden of Public Debt.
(ORANGEVILLE): Burden of Public Debt.
(BELLEVILLE): Burden of Public Debt—The Interest on Debt.
(OAKWOOD): Burden of Public Debt—Our Public Expenditure.
- No. 8.—(NEWCASTLE): Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters.
(LISTOWEL): Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters—The last Sacrifice of \$10,000,000—Collapse of Tory "Boom" Policy.
(ST. THOMAS): North-West Lands.
(HUNTSVILLE): R.R. Policy—Sir John's Subsidies to "Guinea-Pig" Directors—Assisted Immigration and Railway Frauds.
(PARRY SOUND): Railway Policy of Liberals.
(ORANGEVILLE): Railway Policy of Liberals.
(BRANTFORD): The Kansas Slander.
(LISTOWEL): The Sea of Mountains.
- No. 9.—(WINGHAM): Blake's Tribute to Mackenzie.
(STAYNER): Blake's Tribute to Sir Richard Cartwright.
(BRANTFORD): Blake's Tribute to Paterson—Duty of Young Men.
- No. 10.—(WELLAND): Liberal Party, Creeds and Classes.
(ORANGEVILLE): Leaders and Newspapers—The "Mail" Crusade.
- No. 11.—(ASHMER): Prohibition and Politics.
- No. 12.—(TORONTO): Interests of Labour—The Tariff.
(WELLAND): To Knights of Labour.
(BELLEVILLE): Legislation for Labour.
(DESERONTO): Workingmen and Parties.
(HAMILTON): Workingmen and Parties.
- No. 13.—(HAMILTON): Provincial Issues—The Religious Cry—Liberals and Catholics.
- No. 14.—(LINDSAY): North-West Affairs—Neglect, Delay and Mismanagement—Race and Creed Cries.

THE PUBLIC FINANCES.

Tory Promises, and how they have been kept.

ENORMOUS TAXATION AND ENORMOUS DEFICIT.

Has Taxation helped Farmers?

The Price of Wheat.

WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR FARMERS?

At Chesley, after referring to his old relations with the locality, congratulating his audience upon improvements in the County of Bruce within his memory, and paying an eloquent tribute to the old settlers, Mr. Blake proceeded:—"They were engaged as the pioneers in the settlement of the country, in increasing the wealth of the Province and of themselves, in converting the forest into the mixed settlement of town and country which we see with such pride to-day. There are now many railways in your county, due very largely, as I am proud to remember, to the large, liberal and practical railway policy which was brought into operation by myself during my brief tenure of office in the Legislature of Ontario. (Great cheering.) Sometimes I see it said, 'Oh, Blake is an old fossil; he doesn't believe in railway schemes at all'—because I have opposed some mad, inconsiderate plans in which the only object to be gained was a political object. But you will find, if you look at the statute book where the law to which I refer is inscribed, that that law provided the means without which the great practical results which we see in Bruce, in a large part of Huron and Grey, and in many others which might be called the outlying portions of the country, never could have been attained as they have since that day been attained. (Loud and prolonged applause.) You were engaged in political struggles then as now. Then, as now, you had before you different parties asserting different views, but the difference between the parties was not exactly such as it is to-day.

TORY ALIASES.

"The Tory party in the Old World and in Canada has from time to time chosen to adopt *aliases*, it has chosen to adopt new names, it has designated itself by a variety of epithets which it thought from time to time would conceal its identity, and would

enable it to mislead under a new and more attractive guise. (Cheers and laughter.) It was not the Tory party at all I had to oppose when I first came to the County of Bruce. It was the COALITION PARTY—the 'PARTY OF UNION AND PROGRESS.' (Laughter.) They were quite insulted if you called them Tories. (Loud laughter.) Then there was a NO-PARTY PARTY. Then there was a PATENT COMBINATION PARTY. Then it became the NATIONAL POLICY PARTY. As Liberal principles grew strong they have from time to time called themselves 'LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVES,' in order that they might get weak-kneed Reformers to join them because of the name Liberal. (Cheers.) Some of them call themselves CONSERVATIVE-LIBERALS, and so on, so that it is pretty hard to find them out.

LIBERALISM ALWAYS THE SAME.

"We have stuck pretty well to the names we have given ourselves of Liberals and Reformers, and those names represent our principles of that day as they represent our principles now, both in the Old World and in that portion of God's earth which we are called upon to govern and develop. (Loud applause.) Then, as now, the other party, under whatever name it for the time might please to call itself, acted on principles opposed to those which we believe to be right and in the best interest of the country. Then, as now, the struggle between the executive authority and the popular rule went on. There was then, as now, an attempt to grasp for the Executive larger powers than are necessary for the administration of the affairs of the country, and the rule I ventured to lay down to you as a young man, after reading what I could of the political history of other nations, after studying, as well as I could, the principles of popular government, is the rule which, I am thankful to say, I hold more firmly to-day than ever before, that *we ought to give to the Executive and remove from the people's representatives just so much power, and no more than is necessary for the efficient management of the business of administration.* (Loud applause.) Keep to yourselves through your representatives in Parliament, whom you elect and whom you can reject, whose proceedings take place in the light of day, whose speeches and votes you have the opportunity of judging, all the power which it is not clear that the interests of the country absolutely require should be handed over to the Executive, which is really only a committee of your representatives. (Renewed applause.)"

Proceeding, Mr. Blake instanced the Franchise and other Acts as cases in point, and discussed the principles involved briefly. He reviewed briefly some salient points concerning the GERRY-

MANDER ACT, CONSTITUTION OF THE SENATE, INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT as affected by recent disclosures, PROVINCIAL RIGHTS, the INADEQUATE DISCUSSION of affairs in PARLIAMENT due to the DELAY in Government measures and in bringing down information, the CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY, the GOVERNMENT'S NORTH-WEST POLICY, the SENATE, and the NORTH-WEST REBELLION. He then proceeded:—"Each of these subjects would require, for anything like a discussion of them, nearly the whole of the time which I feel it would be right for me to occupy, and I have merely touched upon them in order that I might speak at greater length upon another very important subject—

The Finances of the Country.

"Our friend Mr. Gillies adverted to the question of the expenditure, and Mr. Pardee spoke of the accusations (unjust, as I agree) made against the Local Government simply because under their rule the expenditure has been increased. There is a very serious difference between the position of the Local Government and that of the Federal Government with reference to the increase of expenditure. *The Local Government has certain resources which are not derived by its taxing you. It does not tax you a dollar.* It gets its revenues—except some income from licenses, which I suppose you would not call an objectionable tax in that sense—from the subsidy given by the Federal Government, the amount of which it cannot control and which it does not collect, from investments and from the timber dues. So long as it can make both ends meet, so long is it better to judiciously expend the bulk of the money it receives rather than put it in a napkin and lay it up drawing three per cent. interest. You would not pay a dollar the less for any diminution in the expenditure. I do not mean to say Government should be extravagant or profligate in their dealings with the money placed in their charge, but they have a right to say that they are not burdening you by the expenditure. But the

FEDERAL EXPENDITURE COMES OUT OF THE TAXES.

Some part, of course, is repaid, as in the case of the Post-office expenditure, from which department some revenue is received; but, generally speaking, the bulk of the expenditure is made from the taxation. In 1868 the Federal expenditure was about thirteen and one-half millions. *In 1874, when the Mackenzie Government was first in power, it was about \$23,300,000, showing an increase of \$9,800,000. In 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Government, the expenditure was about \$23,500,000. It rose a little in*

the interval; but at the close of their term they had brought it down so as to show *an increase of only \$200,000*, as compared with that of their initial year of office. In 1883 THE EXPENDITURE HAD GROWN TO ABOUT \$29,000,000, IN 1884 IT WAS \$31,100,000, IN 1885 IT WAS \$35,000,000, OF WHICH \$1,700,000 WAS FOR WAR EXPENSES. They say you ought not to charge the war expenses against them. I suppose that is because you got so much good of it, because you got such a fine return for the investment. If you take that view, of course you may strike it off, but you'll have to pay it all the same. (Cheers and laughter.) We will suppose you will take that view of it and strike off the \$1,700,000. In that case the expenditure was \$33,300,000. In 1886 *the expenditure is estimated at \$38,100,000*, and allowing off, if you choose to allow, \$3,400,000 paid out as war expenses, the expenditure for the year would be \$34,700,000, *showing an increase of \$11,200,000*. In the nineteen years since Confederation there has therefore been an increase of about \$21,200,000, of which

\$21,000,000 UNDER TORY RULE AND \$200,000 UNDER LIBERAL RULE.

I do not tell you that that increase is *all* unjustifiable. I do not act with these men as they acted with Mr. Mackenzie. *They declared that had they been in power they would have governed the country for twenty-two and a half millions a year*, and that he was extravagant because he had spent more. They claimed that you ought to return them to power to reduce his expenditure. They tell you now that the increase under their rule was necessary because of the development of the country and the increase of the population. But the men who, in 1878 and for a few years preceding, told you that the insignificant increase under Mr. Mackenzie was of itself sufficient evidence of extravagance and unjustifiable expenditure, and who *secured power on the pretence and pledge of reducing it*, are not the men who should claim the benefit of such a plea as this, when they *have increased the expenditure by eleven millions of dollars a year*. I do tell you that while a large part of this increase is justifiable, a large part is quite unjustifiable. (Cheers.) You would not expect me to analyze the expenditure of eleven millions, but I will give you a sample or two. Take the

EXPENDITURE ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

In 1878 every Conservative platform in the country echoed with cries against the extravagance of Mr. Mackenzie as to the Civil

Service and their salaries. The orators of that party declared that he had filled all the departments from garret to cellar with political hacks, whom he put in not because the country wanted officers, but because the hacks wanted offices. They said that when he had filled all the buildings from garret to cellar until he could find no more room, he put up another large building, at a cost of a quarter of a million dollars, and filled it also with political hacks. They, the stern economists, called upon you to return them to power, that they might have an opportunity of showing how you could be governed more economically. What was the result? *In 1878 the salaries paid to the Civil Service amounted to \$823,000.* That is a large sum. They said it was a great deal too much, and they promised a speedy reduction. *In the very first year of their term of office they reduced the expenditure under this head to \$986,000.* (Great laughter and cheering.) We were so much pleased with their economy that they felt encouraged, and the next year *they succeeded in reducing it in the same direction to \$1,084,000.* (Renewed laughter.) And last year by the exercise of their own peculiar system of economy they kept it down to \$1,139,000. (Applause.) So that you find that since taking office they have increased or reduced the expenditure under this head—for, I suppose, though the Liberals will call it an increase, the Conservatives will say it is a reduction—*to the extent of \$316,000, or forty per cent.* (Cheers.) Part of that increase is necessary and proper. But part of it is not. Take an example:—

THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

up to the time the Tories came into power, comprised all the public works, including railways and canals. It was managed by one Minister, Mr. Mackenzie himself, who had also the Premiership—(cheers)—and by one staff. *In 1878 the expenditure for salaries and contingencies was \$59,850.* But the Tories cut the Department in two, one the Department of Public Works, and the other the Department of Railways and Canals, each with a Minister and a separate staff. The expenditure for last year was \$100,500, as against \$59,850 in 1878, an increase of over \$40,000 on \$60,000. The ordinary

CONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURE

in 1878 was \$6,542,000. In 1883 it was about \$9,500,000, in 1884, \$11,000,000; in 1885, \$12,600,000, or nearly double what it was in 1878. A great portion of that increase was justifiable and proper; but part of it was needless and improper. Take the

SUPERANNUATION EXPENDITURE.

You know that besides paying our civil servants very fair salaries for the work they do, considering the security of their tenure of office, the shortness of their hours of work, and the regularity of their pay, we have a system of paying them pensions after they are no longer able to serve us. This system, whatever may be said for or against it in principle, is liable to abuse in practice. The Tories said in 1878 that Mr. Mackenzie had abused it, and to prove their statement they quoted the figures to show that under his Government the superannuation allowances had increased from \$64,000 a year to \$106,000 a year. This, they said, was of itself proof of extravagance and corruption. The expenditure is now up to \$203,600, very nearly double the amount which they said was itself proof of the most scandalous jobbery under a Liberal Administration. (Cheers.) Take the

EXPENDITURE UPON INDIANS.

In 1878 the amount was \$421,000. For the last three years it has been more than \$1,100,000 a year. I don't say the increase was unjust—an increase may have been quite necessary. The circumstances had changed since 1878; the Indians had lost the buffalo and it was necessary to do something, even much more than was done in 1878. But the accounts show, the public documents show, the speeches made in Parliament, and the statements therein quoted, as yet unrefuted (and I do not see how they can be refuted as a whole), show that there has been scandalous abuse in the management. (Hear, hear.) ENORMOUS SUMS, quite adequate, with their own exertions, to keep the number of Indians for whose benefit the money is voted in reasonable comfort, HAVE BEEN GIVEN WITH LIBERALITY BY PARLIAMENT, YET THE INDIANS HAVE BEEN IN MANY CASES STARVED, AND IN SOME CASES STARVED TO DEATH, IN THE MEANTIME. I say that a more humiliating and deplorable exhibition than that given by the reports of public officials respecting the treatment of some of the Indian tribes before the rebellion, it would be impossible to conceive of. It is not that the money has not been given to the Government for this service. There is one set of accounts showing an expenditure of \$46,000 for agricultural implements, enormous sums for garden seeds, and so on. And yet the papers show improper or inadequate food to have been supplied to the Indians, under which they and their little ones have in many cases died. Other instances of immorality and misconduct are also, I fear, established. Let me turn to another subject.

THE SURPLUS QUESTION.

These gentlemen, when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, were convulsed with indignation on one occasion because Sir Richard Cartwright, the Finance Minister, in bringing down his budget, stated that he estimated that the balance of receipts over expenditures would be about half a million dollars. He said that half a million was a pretty narrow margin to leave in case the estimate should not be correct. Dr. Tupper—I heard him myself—declared that the Government had no right to have, or to propose to have, even this small surplus. Your business, he said, is not to take from the people half a million more than you expect to spend, but to reduce the burdens of the people by throwing off taxation. Shortly after that they were in power and they got into the era of surpluses. They were indignant because Sir Richard Cartwright estimated for a surplus of half a million, which, as a matter of fact, he never got, because the contingencies occurred which he had feared, and the revenue did not come in. They had surpluses in 1881 of \$4,130,000, in 1882 of \$6,310,000, in 1883 of \$7,050,000, and in 1884 of \$750,000. When they found fault with Sir Richard Cartwright, we told them in reply that Dr. Tupper was quite right in his principle, that it was not proper to propose to take out of the pockets of the people more than, with reasonable caution, the Government might expect to need, but we believed the margin was reasonable, and when these surpluses of theirs came we called upon them to act upon the principle which both parties had declared to be the right one, and reduce taxation. (Hear, hear.) But, no; they refused. Sir John Macdonald, you remember, said that his opinion about surpluses was the same as that of the old squaw about whiskey—a little too much was just enough. (Loud laughter.)

THEY SWALLOWED THEIR PROFESSIONS,

and took out of you in one year fourteen times as much as they said Sir Richard Cartwright was almost criminal in even proposing to take out of you. (Loud cheers.) We said more. If you will apply the principles of human nature, the principles which actuate yourselves in your own affairs, to the affairs of the Government, you will find many things, which are stated to you as *great secrets of statecraft, are not so very difficult to understand after all.* (Loud applause and laughter.) Now, it is human nature that men, as a rule, are more liberal with other people's money than they are with their own. ("Hear, hear," and renewed laughter.) When the question of subscribing to a church, or a

charity, is being discussed, we are often rather disposed to criticise others for being niggardly and to subscribe a large sum for our neighbour. Public men, when they are considering how much money they shall expend, are not likely to forget that it is public money and not their own. There is no percentage taken off their salaries, no tax imposed upon them, and they are naturally liberal. (Laughter.) The spending of it makes friends. There was a steward a long while ago, you remember, who sought to make friends in this way at his master's expense. As long as the people, as a whole, will allow them to go on, it is a very good thing for them to make local appropriations, and to create new offices; and so your best security for the appropriations being economical is to AFFIRM THE PRINCIPLE THAT NO MORE MONEY THAN IS NECESSARY SHALL BE TAKEN OUT OF YOUR POCKETS, because you may be sure that if they take many millions more than they require, they will spend those millions. I have shown you how the expenditure has increased. I have shown you that the taxes are high, not so high as they were at one time, but after all only a tax or two has been taken off, and the taxes are very high indeed. But the era of deficits has come again, and

WE NOW HAVE ENORMOUS DEFICITS,

not because we have reduced taxation, but because we have increased expenditure, through the people of the country having allowed the Tories to tax us more than they could show was necessary. In 1878 the total taxes were \$17,700,000; in 1883 (the boom year) \$29,500,000; in 1885, \$25,400,000; the estimate for 1886 is \$26,000,000, and for 1887 \$27,200,000. *So that the taxes you will be called upon to pay next year will be over a dollar and a half for every dollar near the end of Mr. Mackenzie's term of office.* (Cheers.) They will tell you that it is because we are importing more than we did before. Partly so; but not mainly. In 1877 the rate of duty per hundred dollars of all goods you imported, fine or coarse, free or dutiable, high priced or low priced, was \$13.03. In 1885 the rate was \$18.61. That is an increase of \$5.58 on \$13.03, or about .43 per cent., so that *for the same amount of goods you pay 43 per cent. more taxes.* The amount of estimated taxation, as I make it out, for the year 1887, is about \$30 for every head of a family. That is your burden as it appears, but

YOU DO NOT KNOW EXACTLY WHAT YOUR BURDEN IS,

for you have not the tax gatherer coming to your door with a bill of so much for the Canadian Pacific Railway, so much for

this, that, and the other item. *It is the retail merchant who collects your taxes for the Dominion Government, and he does not thus make out his bills.* I wish he did, because then you would see how much you are paying, and you would be more inquisitive as to the way the money was going. The wholesale importer brings in the goods. They come to Montreal or Toronto and he must get them out of the Customs. He takes them out and pays the duty. He must then find out at what prices to sell them, and to do that he must compute the cost of them. Part of the cost was the duty, he puts an advance upon the whole cost to cover interest, risk, expenses of all kinds, services, and his own profit. He adds, we will say, fifteen per cent. upon the whole, part being, as you see, the duty he has paid. He sells them to the retail merchant, and the retail merchant goes through the same operation. He says: I have to distribute these goods; I have a bale of cloth, a barrel of sugar, and a box of tea, and I have to sell these in a hundred parcels to my customers. What am I to charge? The cost is so much, including the duty, and the importer's advance upon it. He puts an advance of twenty-five per cent. or so upon the whole, *so that by the time you and I pay the tax included in our bill there is between forty and fifty per cent. added to the amount of the duty as part of the cost to us of the goods.* We pay it all, though the treasury doesn't get it all. I have pointed out how the money has gone, to some extent. There is also

THE ITEM OF IMMIGRATION.

In 1878 there was spent on this service the sum of \$180,000, in 1883 \$437,000, in 1884 \$575,000, and in 1885 \$506,000; and this notwithstanding that we were promised, when the Canadian Pacific charter was given, that the railway would do the great work of immigration as the American railway companies did, and save our treasury the expense. This expenditure has been wasteful, corrupt, little useful, and often hurtful. I hope I have made it clear that the burden of taxation deserves your best attention.

ANOTHER PHASE OF TAXATION.

I have pointed out one phase of this question of taxation, and have shown how it affects manufacturers and merchants in their dealings with their customers, and the burden it imposes on consumers. I desire to say further, that the Government have imposed the burden of taxation upon a principle which has proved fallacious. They declared that the farmers needed legislative assistance, and that *they were going to legislate the farmers into comparative wealth and easy circumstances.* They were going

to make the times better by increasing the price of their products and giving them a home market. They were to do this mainly by establishing factories, the hands in which would pay high prices for eggs, chickens, and garden stuff. (Laughter.) Everywhere THE PRICE OF GRAIN WAS TO BE MADE BETTER. We said that in all those articles of which you have a surplus the foreign market will rule the prices. Suppose you are hurt by the American duty on barley, how are you going to help yourself? Put on a similar duty? How will that help you? There was no answer. We said: There is no American barley coming in; what then will be the practical effect of putting on a duty to prevent it from coming in? And yet there were a great many men, intelligent in the ordinary affairs of life, who were gulled by this trick. There are people going about the country—there are some you have heard to-day in this village—with musical voices and pleasant tales, selling you articles warranted to cure every disease from which you suffer—enchanted oils and other magic cures. They do not tell you what the composition of the medicine is or how it is going to act. But they depend upon your saying: Well, we may as well try it; it may do us good; and it can't very well do us harm. A GREAT MANY THEORISTS WHO CLAIMED TO HAVE THE MEDICINE TO CURE THE ILLS OF THE BODY-POLITIC WENT ABOUT WITH THEIR SEDUCTIVE TALES AND WIZARD OILS BEFORE 1878. All of us would much rather be legislated into wealth and ease than win them by our own labour. You were deceived into agreeing to try them. You gave these men a trial. How did that trial succeed? *What about wheat?* (Cheers and laughter.) What about potatoes, the price of which a former speaker quoted? I held a meeting in the rear of my own riding of West Durham the other day. I asked the people the price of wheat. One man said: I bought wheat to-day at 55c. a bushel. I said: That seems to be very low. I hope you got a good bargain. He didn't seem to think he had got a very good bargain. (Laughter and applause) It was goose wheat perhaps; there surely must have been something wrong when the buyer wasn't satisfied with that price. (Loud laughter.) Compare this with the condition of things when the tariff policy had the benefit of a short period of general prosperity. At that time Mr. Stephenson, who was then a member of Parliament, though he has since been promoted by the Premier to be Inspector of Colonization Companies at a salary of \$5,000 a year and travelling expenses, said at a meeting in south-western Ontario: "I'm going to support the Government that has raised the price of wheat from 79 cents to \$1.40 a bushel." And so they boasted of their policy. But now, when the price is low, they say it is the foreign market that controls the price. *And when we ask them why they don't keep up the*

prices, as they promised, they say: "What is the use of talking that way? What sensible man would suppose we could raise the price of wheat? The price here is controlled by the price abroad." (Great applause and laughter.) Did they believe they could raise prices when they made the promise in 1878? If they did, they were fools; if they did not, they were knaves. Either way they are unworthy of your confidence. (Tremendous cheering.)

THEY PROMISED YOU A HOME MARKET

for the product of your farms. In 1873 you had to find a market abroad for five millions of dozens of eggs. In 1885 you had to find a foreign market not only for that five millions, but for about six and one-half millions besides, or in all 11,540,000 dozens. I must admit I have heard a member of Parliament for a not very remote county, Mr. Farrow, of Huron, declare in the House of Commons that it was a fact that the N. P. had done great good in the egg business. For, he said, even the hens had been stimulated and laid more and larger eggs than they formerly did, and we got the benefit in that way. (Loud laughter.) In 1883, the value of the export of eggs alone was two and a quarter millions of dollars, and in 1885 it was \$1,830,000. Yet the export of manufactured articles in 1883 was only \$3,181,000. So that *in the export trade eggs alone were worth more than one-half as much as all the manufactures.* These men said they were going to make you happy and rich in the way I have indicated. We declared that the wealth of this country, as of all countries similarly circumstanced, rested upon a foundation of plain and obvious principles.

THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF ALL WEALTH.

It rested upon the energy, the activity, the economy, and the prudence with which each of us in his own walk of life tried to make the best of his situation and opportunities. (Cheers.) To these and not to Acts passed by Parliament at Ottawa is the prosperity of the country mainly due. Having a fertile soil, if Providence favours us with good crops and we get fair prices, we will do well just in proportion as we each of us exhibit the qualities to which I have referred. *The manufacturing interest is an important interest. I wish it well. I believe our policy is best for it.* I have no desire to injure it. But it is absurd to talk as these men do, about the farmer being dependent upon the manufacturing interest. But it is well that you should see what the real foundations of prosperity are.

COMPARATIVE VALUES OF FARMS AND MANUFACTURES.

A few figures will tell you. In 1884 the CAPITAL INVESTED IN FARMING IN ONTARIO, including the value of your farms (depreciated as they have been of late years in many places, not, of course, on account of, but in spite of the N. P.), and including buildings, stock, agricultural implements, etc., and capital in hand or in bank, WAS ABOUT \$1,100,000,000. The interest upon that for one year at 5 per cent. is \$55,000,000. THE INVESTMENT IN MANUFACTURING INTERESTS IN THE YEAR 1881 WAS \$81,000,000. That included a large number of domestic industries, such as the baker, the blacksmith, the local builder, and a large number of our industries that could not be benefited by the N.P., as the flour miller, whose industry is almost dead since the N.P., and the saw-miller, who has not been benefited, but injured. Strike off for these \$30,000,000. I believe we ought to strike off even more, but I can afford a few millions in this calculation. (Laughter). We have then \$50,000,000 left. It is a disputed point as to what the effects, temporary or permanent, of protection are upon these industries. I do not touch that to-day. I may do so elsewhere. Assume, for the sake of argument, that the effect is somewhat beneficial. Yet *it is reasonable to tell a community composed of farmers, distributors, labourers, and manufacturers, that the prosperity of the farmer depends upon the manufacturer?* (Cheers.) You might as well take a pyramid with a broad base and tapering to a point at the other end, and after considering how it can best be made to stand firmly and solidly on the earth, turn it with the point down, and expect to accomplish your object. (Great cheering.) The eleven hundred millions is that upon which depends the prosperity of the fifty millions. IF YOU ARE FAVOURED, IF YOU THRIVE, IF YOU ARE EXERTING YOURSELVES, YOU WILL HAVE MONEY IN YOUR POCKETS, AND THEN THE MANUFACTURERS WILL DO WELL ALSO. The money does not stay with you. After paying debts and paying for some improvements, the greater part of which is a direct benefit to the manufacturer, the remainder goes out to manufacturers and others, and is distributed. Unless you prosper the manufacturer cannot prosper, tariff or no tariff, and when you prosper the manufacturer of any article which can be reasonably made here will thrive under any readjustment of the tariff that has been talked or thought of. (Cheers.) Well, we are asked: What can you do for the farmer? We are not like these people who said, with high-sounding words, that they could send 211 men to Parliament to draw up Bills and

pass them, to prepare resolutions and carry them, and so make the farmer happy. By listening to these men you simply appointed for yourselves rulers who injure you, and who availed themselves of a temporary spurt of prosperity to renew their lease of power. You have tried the sellers of these magic articles. What has been the result? It seems to me it has been a dismal failure. I say,

WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR THE FARMER AS IT IS?

Take care, first of all, that his burden is kept as light as possible. (Cheers.) *Take care that his burden is not only as light as possible, but that its distribution upon the whole community is made as just as possible*, not as now when not merely is there no attempt even to approximate that rude justice which is the best that we can, with our imperfect system, attain, but when *by means of specific duties the charges upon goods, coarse and cheap, which the poorest have to buy, are heavier far, proportionably, than those upon the fine and dear goods which the rich can afford to buy.* (Cheers.) In the second place see to an

ECONOMICAL EXPENDITURE OF THE REVENUE

from this reduced and fairly distributed taxation. In the third place make an honest effort to increase the means of CHEAP TRANSPORT of the commodities which you have to sell and of the commodities which you want to buy, and to open the avenues of foreign trade. In the fourth place secure FAIR AND HONEST ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE and of the affairs of the country. This is what the Legislature can do. (Loud cheers.) To tell you that we can by passing Acts of Parliament make you rich, is what I cannot honestly do. I do not believe it can be done. I did not believe it in 1878 or in 1882. Our task, limited as I have stated it, is yet a very difficult one. The extravagant system adopted, the high permanent charges which have been incurred, the interests which have been created, make it difficult to do what might have been done in 1878 had we continued in power, and even in 1882 had we been successful in winning a verdict from the people. But because it is difficult it becomes all the more necessary that it should be attempted and that an end should thus be put to the present course of extravagance, incompetence, and maladministration. *You have a country comparatively embarrassed, a country whose future has been impaired by the maladministration and incompetency of the men in whom you trusted. You have a country whose moral standing is not what it ought to have been, by reason of the scandals to which I*

have referred, which have disgraced the Legislature and, by reflex action, have disgraced the people.

BUT YOU HAVE A COUNTRY WITH GREAT CAPABILITIES, WITH CONSIDERABLE RECUPERATIVE FORCES, WHOSE CONDITION MAY BE IMPROVED, WHOSE STANDING MAY BE RESTORED, IF ITS PEOPLE WILL BUT RECOGNIZE AND PERFORM THEIR PLAIN AND OBVIOUS DUTY. GENTLEMEN, WITH YOU I LEAVE IT. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

(3)

X

H

BE

LE

US

TO-